

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 3 and 6 are amended. No new matter is added by these amendments. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to claims 1, 3 and 6 for informalities. Specifically, the office objects to claim 1 asserting that the feature "a management controller" is lacking support in the specification. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. Claim 1 recites "a management controller that manages progress of the multiple processings." Page 4, lines 4-6 and page 4, line 25-page 5, line 2 of the specification describes the feature a management control part for managing the progress of each of the processings in the job. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the feature "a management controller" is sufficiently supported in the specification and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the claim.

Claims 3 and 6 are amended to obviate the objections to the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the claims.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2 and 5-17 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for failing to claim statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1, 2 and 5-17 claim statutory subject matter under MPEP §2106 IV because they claim a machine (*i.e.*, hardware). Claim 1 recites "a service processing system." The specification at least at Page 3, lines 23-25 indicates that the service processing system is part of a network. Since a network is structural (*i.e.*, hardware), Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 recites statutory subject matter. Further, claims 5-17 recite the feature "a job management device." The specification at least at Page 4, lines 9-11 indicates that the job management device is part of a network. Since a network is structural (*i.e.*, hardware), Applicants respectfully assert that claims 5-17

recite statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,069,536 to Yaung. Additionally, the Office Action rejects claims 8, 12, 13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0061266 to Ouchi; rejects claims 9 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,918,226 to Tarumi et al. (hereinafter "Tarumi"); rejects claims 10 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,200,860 to Ghaffar; and rejects claims 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0005229 to Palekar et al. (hereinafter "Palekar"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Office Action asserts that Yaung teaches all of the features recited in the independent claims. However, Yaung does not teach including at least "a notice part that sends a notice during the progress of the multiple processings based on contents recited in the notice conditioned data," as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claims 3, 5, 6 and 7.

The Office Action asserts Yaung, in col. 4, lines 47-67; col. 6, lines 9-13, 27-34; and col. 7, lines 55-59, teaches performing specified multiple processings of document data according to a work flow in sending a notification during the progress of the process in a work flow based on notification settings associated with the processes in the work flow. However, Yaung teaches the sending of a notification feature that only notifies the user associated with the start node that a deadline has passed during which the user designated action for that node was not completed. Therefore, the notification feature of Yaung is not sent during the progress of the process, but instead, is sent after the deadline has passed. Therefore, Yaung, does not teach, nor would have suggested "a notice part that sends a notice

during the progress of the multiple processings based on contents recited in the notice conditioned data," as recited in amended claim 1 and similarly in claims 3, 5, 6 and 7.

Ouchi, Tarumi, Ghaffar and Palekar fail to disclose or suggest the above features, and therefore, fail to make up for the above noted deficiency of Yaung.

For at least the reasons above, Yaung cannot reasonably be considered to teach, nor would have suggested, the combinations of all the features recited in at least independent claims 1, 3 and 5-7. Further, claims 2, 4 and 8-17 would also not have been suggested by the applied references for the at least respective dependencies of these claims on allowable independent claims 1, 3 and 5-7, respectively, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 147§103(a) are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Tiffany J. Brooks
Registration No. 57,912

JAO:TJB/jth

Date: March 18, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
